



Merchant, P., Maguire, G., & Randall, R. (2018). Introduction: Domestic Spaces in Contemporary Latin American Cinema. *Journal of Romance Studies*, 18(2), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.3828/jrs.2018.11>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.3828/jrs.2018.11](https://doi.org/10.3828/jrs.2018.11)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Liverpool University Press at <https://online.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/10.3828/jrs.2018.11> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

House or Home? Domestic Spaces in Contemporary Latin American Cinema

Paul Merchant, University of Bristol

Geoffrey Maguire, University of Cambridge

Rachel Randall, University of Bristol

Michael Haneke's most recent feature film, *Happy End* (2017), like many of his previous works, presents the spectator with an unflattering portrait of European bourgeois domestic life. Haneke has won plaudits for his forensic examination of the complex politics of life at home, and his work has occasioned reflections on the uneasy and unsettling nature of the domestic spaces it depicts (Sorfa 2006; Geyh 2011). Interest in Haneke's work reflects a broader preoccupation with the continued possibility of finding 'home' – understood as a kind of psychic wholeness or successful identification with a material environment – in the spaces traditionally marked out for that purpose. This preoccupation is visible not only in European film studies (McNeill 2011; Rascaroli 2013), but across a wide spectrum of the social sciences and humanities.¹ Several recent studies foreground notions of instability and change, rather than the reinforcement of identity, in their analyses. The geographers Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling argue that

[m]aterial and imaginative geographies of home are relational: the material form of home is dependent on what home is imagined to be, and imaginaries of home are influenced by the physical forms of dwelling. (2006: 22)

This notion of reciprocal exchange between human and nonhuman environment is also apparent in Daniel Miller's stated desire to view the domestic sphere as 'the source and setting of mobility and change', and to ask 'what the home does with us', rather than viewing it simply as a site of consumption or as an 'anchor to kinship' (2001: 4). This pervasive sense of

uncertainty lies behind many recent critical approaches to the domestic sphere on screen. Dwayne Avery argues that Freud's concept of the *unheimlich* (2003), rendered in English as either the uncanny or the unhomely, has come to characterise existence in the globalised present, in which spatial, temporal and corporeal borders are tested and erased. 'Reading the cinematic unhomely', Avery proposes, 'is a multifaceted experience that takes us into the heart of what it means to live in today's global, technology-driven societies' (2014: 4). Avery's study of contemporary North American and European cinema is correspondingly informed by the work of thinkers such as Paul Virilio and Marc Augé, though Avery ultimately diverges from them in suggestively positing that the unhomely 'maintain[s] an ethical dimension, as the home's destabilization can lead to new ways of thinking about and experiencing the place of home' (27).

Avery's is undoubtedly a productive approach, yet his book is symptomatic of a potential blind spot in contemporary studies of domestic space on film, given that it focuses almost exclusively on productions from the global North. There is a risk that Eurocentric scholarship on the cinematic spaces of home reduces citizens or regions such as Africa, the Middle East and Latin America to the status of migrant and exile.ⁱⁱ This special issue argues that recent cinematic productions from Latin America provoke many of the same questions outlined above, as well as others that are specific to particular national and regional circumstances. The films analysed in this issue encourage consideration of the possibility (and indeed desirability) of forming symbolic or affective attachments with the architectural spaces typically described as 'domestic'. Much contemporary Latin American filmmaking seeks to uncover uncomfortable – and sometimes unhomely – networks of power relations, hierarchies founded on gender, race or class, that lie behind any image of domesticity. The techniques that contemporary films employ in this excavation, moreover, both mimic and contest senses of

feeling ‘at home’ for their spectators. In short, in these works the relation between place and identity, and indeed the meaning of each of those terms, appear strikingly unsettled.

Freud, Heidegger, Bachelard: the housing of identity

It is our contention that this development responds to a constellation of circumstances in Latin America at the turn of the twenty-first century, from the advent of digital video technologies to the uneasy persistence of colonial hierarchies. These ideas, and others, will be explored both in this introduction and through each of the essays themselves. It should nonetheless also be recognised that the house has occupied a privileged position in ‘Western’ thought for many centuries. Mark Wigley argues that since the time of Plato, the house has always been the ‘exemplar of presentation’ for the philosophical tradition that Jacques Derrida termed the ‘metaphysics of presence’ (1993: 103). Wigley further suggests that under this schema, the house ‘is not simply the paradigm of the operations of the idea. Rather, the idea itself is understood as a paradigm [...] or architectural model’ (103).

For a number of twentieth-century thinkers, it was not merely an abstract ‘idea’ that was conceived in such terms, but human identity itself. One of these thinkers has already been mentioned: Freud turns on several occasions to images of the house in his interpretations of dreams, presenting it as a privileged symbol of the human body, with its constituent parts corresponding to distinct organs, notably genitalia (1991: 156–57, 320–21, 472, 482). For his part, Carl Jung questioned the ‘almost exclusive personalism’ of Freudian psychology, suggesting that the house in fact provided an archetypal model of the structure of the human psyche (Jung 1963: 182–85). Gaston Bachelard developed Jung’s idea within a peculiarly lyrical form of phenomenology in *The Poetics of Space*, asserting that the house provides the model for the human conception of the universe, ‘the human being’s first world’ (1969: 7).

Bachelard argues that human identity is always *housed*, and his concept of ‘topoanalysis’ seeks to explore the interrelation of the psyche with distinct parts of the domestic interior (cellar, attic, etc.) (1969: 9).ⁱⁱⁱ Bachelard’s concern with the production of meaningful dwelling via this psychological investment in domestic space echoes the writings of Martin Heidegger. In his essay ‘Being Dwelling Thinking’, Heidegger argues that dwelling (characterised by a sense of unity with the space of the world) is distinct from mere housing as the architectural provision of shelter (2011: 254). Heidegger claims that ‘the *proper plight of dwelling*’, meant here as a fundamental sense of homelessness in the modern world, ‘does not lie merely in a lack of houses’ (2011: 254, original emphasis).

Heidegger’s lament returns us to the notion, discussed above, that modernity is inherently unhomely. Yet the proposal of a fundamental connection between human identity and a (frequently idealised, rural or bourgeois) house has not been exempt from critique. Anthony Vidler has suggested that both Heidegger’s and Bachelard’s ideas of dwelling are nostalgic constructs prompted by the wars and Depression of early twentieth-century Europe (1992: 7–8). John David Rhodes, meanwhile, notes that Bachelard gives universal psychological validity to a house that is conspicuously large and well-appointed: the size and ‘verticality’ of the dwelling are essential to its ability to function as a ‘body of images that give mankind proofs or illusions of stability’ (Rhodes 2017: 29; Bachelard 1969: 17). These critiques point to a risk similar to the one outlined above: that of ignoring modes of interrelation between human subjects and domestic spaces that do not conform to influential or prevailing European models. It is with this risk in mind that this special issue foregrounds the complexity and uncertainty of that relation. In none of the works analysed here can the house be straightforwardly read as a symbolic representation of the human psyche or of political communities.

Why the house, still?

A question might therefore be asked of what value remains in the interrogation of these relationships. It would be easy to assume that, in the words of geographer Doreen Massey,

the vast current reorganizations of capital, the formation of a new global space, and in particular its use of new technologies of communication, have undermined an older sense of a 'place-called-home', and left us placeless and disorientated. (1994: 163)

Yet, as Massey argues, this argument makes little allowance for unevenness in the experience of what is commonly termed late capitalism or postmodernity across the globe: not everywhere have local places been subsumed into the homogenised space of the global. The preponderance of new urban enclosures in Latin America is a stark reminder of this (Caldeira 1996; Svampa 2008). Moreover, Massey notes, for many in those parts of the world that were subject to colonisation, 'the security of the boundaries of the place called home must have dissolved long ago' (1994: 165). Massey insists on abandoning a dichotomised conception of place (as enclosure) and space (as 'outside') in favour of one in which the identity of any place, domestic or other, is 'open and provisional', a contested node in a much larger network of social interactions (1994: 168-69).

Attention to cinema's interaction with the domestic sphere can demonstrate the force of Massey's argument. Cinema is, after all, a paradigmatic example of an aesthetic practice that is forever caught between local engagement and transnational networks. An influential body of scholarship on the relations between film and the (urban) built environment has, moreover, identified parallels between the camera's operations of cutting and montage and the architectural plan or city layout (Clarke 1997; Barber 2002; Pallasmaa 2007). Yet some striking recent work in film studies seeks to nuance this relation: Rhodes, for instance, suggests that a

rush to outline an analogy between the house and the film camera risks obscuring the hierarchies, alienation and (gendered) repression inscribed in real estate property. Conversely, he claims, 'a serious reckoning with the cinematic spectacle of property will necessarily dislodge us from the cozy familiarity we have with houses and with cinema' (2017: 12). Rhodes' emphasis on the inequalities of the relation between film and domestic interior, and his theorisation of visual pleasure as 'inherently bound up in questions of possession and dispossession' (2017: 22), are especially pertinent when thinking of recent Latin American film, given the stark housing inequities in the region and the problems associated with contemporary urban experience.

Approaches such as these suggest that though the house features as an allegorical figure for the nation in much 'foundational' Latin American literature (Sommer 1991; Álvarez-Rubio 2007), and indeed in early cinema from the region that imitates the Hollywood studio model, critical assessments of its role in contemporary film need not remain within such frameworks. Indeed, Joanna Page's assessment of the politicisation of private space in the work of Lucrecia Martel points precisely to the decay of these allegorical constructions (2009: 180–94). The filmed house is, as will become clear in this issue, a rather less stable and predictable medium for the articulation of identities in contemporary cinema. Recent work on Latin American cinema has made this clear in terms of gender relations: studies of Martel's films, and of those of directors such as Albertina Carri and Lucía Puenzo, note how the home becomes the setting for the upheaval of traditional familial structures.^{iv} There is a sense in these works that for all its oppressive associations, the very fabric of domestic space might provide a vector for the reimagining of social relations. In this respect, the films of Martel and those influenced by her recall the feminist perspective of bell hooks, for whom home 'is that place which enables and promotes varied and ever changing perspectives, a place where one discovers new ways of seeing reality, frontiers of difference' (1990: 148).

In much contemporary Latin American film, houses and apartments appear to take on precisely this function. A short answer to the question of why domestic spaces in Latin American cinema merit further investigation is, then, that they are remarkably persistent as a topic of cinematic concern. This persistence is aided both by the growth of portable and digital video technologies, which have become ever more closely intertwined with the fabric of the house itself (McQuire 2008: 182), and by a diminishing faith in established public forms of sociability (Lechner 2006: 367). For all that a powerful branch of Latin American cultural studies has, since the millennium, argued that Latin America should be envisaged as ‘sites of interruption to any totalizing idea of place, knowledge, or the proper’ (Jenckes 2004: 267), and academic practice as the circulation of ‘irruptions or interruptions’ that ‘must not be reduced to meanings of places’ (2004: 269), contemporary Latin American cinema shows place, meaning and identity to be in constant, uneasy flux at home.

House or home? Locating the domestic in Latin America

The articles that comprise this special issue build on the recent surge in critical analyses of domestic space in Southern Cone and Brazilian cinemas, which have demonstrated how the home has come to serve as the focal point for the erosion of any clear distinction between the public and private spheres (Page 2009; Luca 2017; Merchant 2017). Five of the six articles contained in this issue examine recent films made in Argentina, Chile and Brazil, while Liz Harvey-Kattou’s analysis of Hernán Jiménez’s oeuvre constitutes a valuable exploration of contemporary Costa Rican cinema, which has so far received scant scholarly attention within this burgeoning field. Despite the differing national contexts to which they pertain, these films reflect the ways in which the distinct socio-political realities of contemporary, neoliberal Latin American nation-states have contributed to the portrayal of the cinematic house as permeable

and vulnerable to the outside world, on the levels of both mise-en-scène and diegesis. Nevertheless, as suggested above, the articles contained herein also discern a recent tendency in Latin American documentary and fiction film to eschew any facile allegorical conflation of home and nation, contrasting with earlier cinematic offerings from the region. While it is clear in all of the films chosen for analysis that socio-political and historical concerns impinge upon the domestic sphere and its cinematic representation, our contributors emphasise the ‘unsettled’ implications of any such intrusions, problematising, for example, hegemonic or state-sponsored narratives that celebrate the affective or political importance of particular types of dwellings.

In her contribution to this issue, Adriana Massidda examines two Argentine films, *Diagnóstico esperanza* (dir. César González 2013) and *Villa* (dir. Ezio Massa 2013), which challenge the state-endorsed notion of the home as a cell of a larger, normalised social system. Through their cinematic representation of specific social housing complexes and well-known *porteño* shantytowns, these films contest both the ‘stigmatising discourses’ and the ‘grand rhetoric’ of urban modernisation – or ‘nation building’ – used to promote public projects of demolition and the rehousing of shantytown residents over the course of the twentieth century in Argentina. Massidda situates her filmic analysis within the long and contested history of informal dwellings in Argentina, arguing that both *Diagnóstico* and *Villa* act as productive interventions that ‘open up new conversations about the ideals and practices that surround the house, and by doing so embody a new route to interrogate the relation between human practice and the domestic environment’. In the subsequent article, Harvey-Kattou continues to complicate and challenge the capacity of domestic sphere to act as a microcosm of national life, drawing on the work of Avery to suggest that the home functions in the work of Costa Rican director Jiménez as a ‘multi-scalar’ concept (2014: 13). Through a close reading of *Doble llave y cadena* (2005), *A ojos cerrados* (2009) and *El regreso* (2011), Harvey-Kattou observes

that the nostalgic vision of domestic harmony in traditional, rural abodes, as well as the idealised conception of a pacific Costa Rican national character, are undermined by Jiménez in his portrayal of the home as a space of imprisonment, insecurity and oppression, both within and outside the country's capital, San José. Both Harvey-Kattou and Massidda in this way underscore the previously signalled importance of historically situating any analysis of the domestic space in Latin American cinema within its distinct regional and national contexts.

In a similar fashion to Jiménez's *El regreso*, Chilean director Tiziana Panizza's experimental documentary *Remitente* (2008), analysed in this special issue by María Paz Peirano, further complicates any wholesale association of the home with a concrete place or conception of national identity, as it explores the defamiliarisation (or 'reverse culture shock') experienced upon returning home after a period living abroad. Indeed, Panizza's *Remitente* forms part of a trilogy that traces and collects fragments of domestic or familial spaces in multiple different nations, including England, Chile, Italy and South Africa, thereby instituting a nomadic yet affective relation to 'home' that nonetheless relies upon the privilege of being able to travel globally. For Peirano, the experimental, multimedial collages of found footage, home movies and personal images that compose Panizza's oeuvre 'constitute a handmade, emotional archive reflecting a domestic mode of production that repositions the possibilities of home movies for observation and cultural expression beyond the mere idealization of home'. It is the potential for Panizza's films to transcend individual experience through their dialogue with cultural and political imaginaries that, as Peirano ultimately contends, endows such an archive with the capacity to act not only as a marker of the imbrication of the public sphere into the domestic but also as a means of questioning the very significance of these terms in a Latin American context.

Unsettled at home

Consequently, both the critiques contained within this issue and the films they analyse broadly renounce idealised, nostalgic or Bachelardian notions of home as a domain securely fixed within a specific place and/or time. Instead, they are united by their investigations of the ‘uncanny’ or ‘heterotopian’ aspects of domestic spheres, which frequently dispel any sense of domestic safety or comfort. This special issue endeavours to investigate the varied manifestations of the (un)homely onscreen, thereby refining contemporary critical perspectives regarding our interactions with and within the domestic space. In order to do so, two of its contributors, Paul Merchant and Harvey-Kattou, draw explicitly on Homi Bhabha’s observation that ‘the unhomely is the shock of recognition of the world-in-the-home, the home-in-the-world’ (1992: 141). When commenting on the ways that domestic and national narratives uncannily overlap, Bhabha suggests that ‘the intimate recesses of the domestic space become sites for history’s most intricate invasions’ (1992: 141). Merchant draws on Bhabha’s framework to examine the way that the bourgeois cinematic home in Ignacio Agüero’s *El otro día* (2012) can operate as a national ‘counter-archive’ that complicates and contests the possibility of community both within and beyond the domestic sphere. Similar themes can be traced in Peirano’s exploration of Panizza’s epistolary domestic trilogy, thereby establishing that the historical and affective significance of the home-space represents a crucial concern in contemporary Chilean documentary, as well as an important counterpoint for other national cinemas in the region.

In their respective contributions, Geoffrey Maguire and Rachel Randall explore affective domestic and familial relationships that involve children and adolescents, but which also permit an interrogation of the way that ‘public’ socio-political and historical relationships are inevitably implicated within intimate home-spaces. Maguire’s analysis of contemporary Argentine films set during the military dictatorship elucidates the way in which the gaze and

experiences of child protagonists have been deployed both to interrogate intergenerational tensions and ‘to pluralise dominant historical perspectives towards the era’. Through his focus on the parallels between the liminality of safe houses and the heterotopic nature of childhood, Maguire underscores the potential of the domestic space to act as the site for a re-politicisation of historical perspectives towards left-wing militancy, doing so in this case at a generational remove. Randall, for her part, analyses two recent Brazilian documentaries that offer compelling, affective portrayals of the relationships between maids, nannies and the children for whom they care. Their depictions are undoubtedly designed to encourage a critique of the exploitative class and ‘race’ relations that continue to undergird privileged family homes. Randall’s focus on the bourgeois home here not only echoes current debates in Brazilian society, particularly in terms of recent changes to domestic labour laws, but also highlights a significant trend in Latin American cinema more generally towards the deconstruction of the affective and symbolic power relations that are both maintained and concealed by the everyday spaces of the middle-class home.

One of the most distinctive facets of Latin American filmic depictions of domestic space identified in this special issue is the recurring allusion to the way in which the private, domestic or familial domain frequently threatens to subsume the public or political sphere in the region. As Merchant notes in his contribution, ‘questions of politics and identity have been addressed through the household in Chilean culture with remarkable consistency’. Indeed, beyond demonstrating the way in which public concerns are implicated in the private sphere, the lack of security and vulnerability this implies leads either to the depiction of homes that are in crisis and on the verge of breaking down, or that are characterised by their transience and unification of distinct spatialities and temporalities. This is perhaps because, while cinema from Latin America is ever more concerned with the domestic sphere, it is ever less certain of its value or significance. In recent productions, the home is no longer a refuge from waves of

social or economic upheaval, as was the case in much early film from the region. Instead, it is a space where class, gender, and national identities are tested, stretched, transformed and produced. Though such a conception of the home has acquired fresh potency in recent years, something of its origins can be seen in late twentieth-century productions such as *Julio comienza en Julio* (Caiozzi 1979) and *La estrategia del caracol* (Cabrera 1993).

This increased sense of uncertainty, which frequently becomes visible through the formal experimentation permitted by new technology, responds in part to a widespread preoccupation about insecurity in Latin American urban environments – particularly among the middle and upper classes. Several of the films examined in this issue emphasise the impossibility of separating the home from external, criminal enterprises, or from social marginality. Furthermore, similarly to the films of Brazilian director Kleber Mendonça Filho, productions analysed here including those of Jiménez and Agüero either dwell or touch upon the increasing ‘verticality’ of various Latin American cityscapes, which are dominated by a growing number of tower blocks and houses surrounded by tall metal bars, or walls topped with barbed wire. The design of urban dwellings and the human interactions they are planned either to encourage or prevent – between neighbours, family members, and with domestic employees, among others – reveal a concern with notions of community (or the lack thereof), which unites many of the films examined in this issue.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, these aspects of the Latin American domestic space appear to feature heavily in the memories of the directors or actors involved in both the fictional and documentary films analysed, often taking centre stage within their portrayals of specific recollections of ‘home’. This is clear both in fiction films, such as *Infancia clandestina* (2011), which, as Maguire points out, draws on director Benjamín Ávila’s own childhood experiences during Argentina’s military dictatorship, as well as in the documentaries examined, including those directed by Gabriel Mascaro and Consuelo Lins, as well as Panizza and Agüero. The

latter three have produced intimate portrayals of domestic life that are recorded in an essayistic style and could be termed ‘audiovisual collages’, a term Peirano employs in her article. These often combine ‘found footage’ of earlier eras with contemporary home videos, thereby endeavouring to evoke the complex emotional registers present within different households. Peirano argues that although these kinds of auteur films are inevitably ‘centred in the filmmaker’s subjectivity’, they cannot be understood merely as ‘extensions of an individual self’. It is clear that these extremely personal representations of the domestic space intersect with different temporalities and spatialities, including the legacy of slavery in Brazil in Lins’ and Mascaro’s documentaries, and of colonial or maritime exploration in Agüero’s work.

Heterotopia, counter-archive and the *arkheion*

Accordingly, then, while critics have emphasised that houses in Chilean, Argentine and Brazilian film have frequently been associated with patriarchal politics and the trauma invoked by the (imposition of) authoritarian military dictatorships (Page 2009; Maguire 2017; Randall 2017: 35-66), in this special issue we approach the house, rather, as a palimpsestic or heterotopian space that layers – or incorporates fragments of – collective and personal memories. Peirano, for instance, argues that Panizza’s films foreground the way in which memory ‘is alive and moves in unpredictable directions’, while Merchant suggests that in *El otro día*, the home is depicted as a space in which ‘personal memory and national history meet’. Whereas Agüero’s and Panizza’s films draw on the essayistic, found footage-style documentary filmmaking described above for their dynamic approach toward memory and the domestic space, the homes portrayed in the fiction films *Infancia clandestina* and *Kamchatka* (dir. Marcelo Piñeyro 2002) are read by Maguire as instituting playful Foucauldian heterotopias. These unite a variety of spaces and places that not only relate to the ensuing

military dictatorship, but also to their child protagonists' experience of it and, consequently, to their subjective development. In *Infancia clandestina*, for instance, the heterotopian quality of the domestic space is powerfully evoked through comic-strip style animated sequences that are both expressive of the boy protagonist's difficulty in processing particularly violent experiences and incorporate historical events that the boy could not have experienced. Maguire's contention that both *Infancia clandestina* and *Kamchatka* employ the home as a space through which to explore the experience of left-wing militancy during the Argentine dictatorship and to pluralise historical narratives relating to the period dovetails productively with Merchant's conceptualisation of the home as a potential 'counter-archive'.

This is nonetheless an 'uneasy' counter-archive, notes Merchant, as although experimental filmic techniques, dynamic conceptualisations of memory and a focus on alternative or marginal housing are suggestive of the ways in which domestic spaces can be adapted and re-appropriated by individuals and through cinema, this does not circumvent the home's enduring association with access to, or ownership of, private property. Massidda's observation that shantytowns and their inhabitants are overwhelmingly stigmatised within the Argentine cultural imaginary reinforces the status of the bourgeois home as the approved model of 'normative' domesticity, while the dream of home ownership is associated with independence and potential emancipation for various 'live-in' maids in Lins' *Babás*. Indeed, the fact that home ownership is often restricted to the middle or upper classes complicates the space's revolutionary or deconstructive potential. As Merchant argues of *El otro día*, there is an implication that 'the middle-class home is the only stable location of culture in the film', remitting us to Jacques Derrida's *arkheion*, a conception of the house 'as locus of official history and source of authority'. Interestingly, this issue parallels the problem that some contributors identify in certain directors' choices to make essay-style films about their homes, given that auteur cinema has been viewed as relying on a notion of individual (often masculine)

directorial genius (Marsh 2012: 164), and as engendering a strong sense of ‘ownership’ over a particular cinematic work. Indeed, these directors are in the privileged position, and endowed of the voice, necessary to intervene in hegemonic narratives relating to national history and identity via film, and through the spaces of their homes.

As certain scholars have already noted, there has been a clear turn in contemporary Latin American cinema – in particular in films from Argentina, Brazil and Chile – towards the bourgeois family home (Page 2009; Merchant 2017), including but by no means limited to an interest in domestic labour relations. This trend is palpable in contemporary films produced by directors whose work has already received significant scholarly attention (and so is not the focus of our analyses here), including Anna Muylaert, Fellipe Barbosa, Kleber Mendonça Filho, João Moreira Salles, Lucrecia Martel and Sebastián Silva. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that all but one of the articles that comprise this issue reflect directly on the representation of middle-class, or bourgeois, domestic spaces. A corollary of this focus on the bourgeois home appears to be the evocation or exploration of affective ties within this cinematic space, as has already been intimated. Several articles in the edition emphasise that the production of affect, or the creation of an ‘emotional archive’ (Peirano), can foreground hierarchical or exploitative domestic relationships, but may also allow difficult issues to be circumvented. Consequently, we draw and extend on recent readings of contemporary European cinema (McNeill 2011; Sorfa 2006), which have pointed to the multidimensional and unstable nature of the concept of ‘home’ and used it as a lens through which to develop innovative analyses of structures of affect, belonging and control.

In sum, the dwellings analysed through the films studied here condense questions of modernity, traumatic (post)memory, and relations both affective and economic. They thus respond to political contexts in which national and local power structures find themselves increasingly challenged by transnational flows of capital and people. This special issue takes

account of these changes, as well as of a growing critical awareness of the political significance of everyday material environments and domestic practices.

Works cited

- Álvarez-Rubio, Pilar (2007) *Metáforas de la casa en la construcción de identidad nacional: cinco miradas a Donoso, Eltit, Skármeta y Allende* (Santiago de Chile: Cuarto Propio).
- Andrews, Eleanor, Stella Hockenhull and Frances Pheasant-Kelly (eds.) (2016) *Spaces of the Cinematic Home: Behind the Screen Door* (New York and London: Routledge).
- Avery, Dwayne (2014) *Unhomely Cinema* (London: Anthem Press).
- Bachelard, Gaston (1969) *The Poetics of Space*, trans. by Maria Jolas (Boston: Beacon Press).
- Barber, Stephen (2002) *Projected Cities: Cinema and Urban Space* (London: Reaktion).
- Bhabha, Homi (1992) 'The World and the Home', *Social Text* 31/32, 141-53, doi:10.2307/466222.
- Blunt, Alison and Robyn Dowling (2006) *Home* (New York: Routledge).
- Caldeira, Teresa (1996) 'Fortified Enclaves: The New Urban Segregation', *Public Culture* 8.2, 303–28, doi:10.1215/08992363-8-2-303.
- Clarke, David B. (ed.) (1997) *The Cinematic City* (London: Routledge).
- Freud, Sigmund (1991) *The Interpretation of Dreams*, The Penguin Freud Library, ed. by James Strachey and Angela Richards, trans. by James Strachey (London: Penguin Books).
- (2003) *The Uncanny*, Penguin Classics, trans. by David McLintock (London: Penguin).

- Geyh, Paula E (2011) 'Cosmopolitan Exteriors and Cosmopolitan Interiors: The City and Hospitality in Haneke's Code Unknown', in *The Cinema of Michael Haneke: Europe Utopia*, ed. by Ben McCann and David Sorfa (New York: Wallflower), 105–14.
- Heidegger, Martin (2011) *Basic Writings: From Being and Time (1927) to The Task of Thinking (1964)*, ed. by David Farrell Krell (London: Routledge).
- hooks, bell (1990) *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics* (Boston: South End Press).
- Jenckes, Kate (2004) 'The "New Latin Americanism" or the End of Regionalist Thinking?', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 4.3, 247–70, doi:10.1353/ncr.2005.0021.
- Jung, C. G. (1963) *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, ed. by Aniela Jaffé, trans. by Richard Winston and Clara Winston (London: Fontana Paperbacks).
- Lechner, Norbert (2006) *Obras escogidas* (Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones), 1 <<http://www.digitaliapublishing.com/a/13059/>> [accessed 26 January 2016].
- Luca, Tiago de (2017) "'Casa Grande & Senzala": Domestic Space and Class Conflict in *Casa Grande* and *Que horas ela volta?*', in *Space and Subjectivity in Contemporary Brazilian Cinema*, ed. by Mariana Cunha and Antonio M. da Silva (London: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Maguire, Geoffrey (2017) *The Politics of Postmemory: Violence and Victimhood in Contemporary Argentine Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Mallett, Shelley (2004) 'Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature', *The Sociological Review* 52.1, 62–89, doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00442.x.
- Marsh, Leslie (2012) *Brazilian Women's Filmmaking: From Dictatorship to Democracy* (Urbana, Chicago and Springfield: University of Illinois Press).
- Martin, Deborah (2016) *The Cinema of Lucrecia Martel* (Manchester: Manchester University

Press).

Massey, Doreen B. (1994) *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

McNeill, Isabelle (2011) 'Virtual Homes: Space and Memory in the Work of Yamina Benguigui', *L'Esprit Créateur* 51.1, 12–25, doi:10.1353/esp.2011.0001.

McQuire, Scott (2008) *The Media City: Media, Architecture and Urban Space* (Los Angeles: Sage).

Merchant, Paul (2017) 'New Constructions of House and Home in Contemporary Argentine and Chilean Cinema (2005-2015)'. PhD Diss., University of Cambridge.

Miller, Daniel (ed.) (2001) *Home Possessions: Material Culture behind Closed Doors* (Oxford: Berg).

Naficy, Hamid (2001) *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press).

Nouzeilles, Gabriela (2005) 'Postmemory Cinema and the Future of the Past in Albertina Carri's *Los Rubios*', *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 14.3, 263–78, doi:10.1080/13569320500382500.

Page, Joanna (2009) *Crisis and Capitalism in Contemporary Argentine Cinema* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).

Pallasmaa, Juhani (2007) *The Architecture of Image: Existential Space in Cinema* (Helsinki: Rakennustieto).

Randall, Rachel (2017) *Children on the Threshold in Contemporary Latin American Cinema: Nature, Gender and Agency* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books).

- Rascaroli, Laura (2013) 'A Common European Home? Filming the Urban Thirdspace in Marc Isaacs's *Lift* (2001)', *Studies in Documentary Film* 7.1, 3–15, doi:10.1386/sdf.7.1.3_1.
- Rhodes, John David (2017) *Spectacle of Property: The House in American Film* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press).
- Sommer, Doris (1991) *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Sorfa, David (2006) 'Uneasy Domesticity in the Films of Michael Haneke', *Studies in European Cinema* 3.2, 93–104, doi:10.1386/seci.3.2.93_1.
- Svampa, Maristella (2008) *Los que ganaron: la vida en los countries y barrios privados*, 2nd edn (Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos).
- Vidler, Anthony (1992) *The Architectural Uncanny: Essays in the Modern Unhomely* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Wigley, Mark (1993) *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press).

Filmography

- Agüero, Ignacio (dir.) (2012), *El otro día*.
- Ávila, Benjamín (dir.) (2011), *Infancia clandestina*.
- Cabrera, Sergio (dir.) (1993), *La estrategia del caracol*.
- Caiozzi, Silvio (dir.) (1979), *Julio comienza en Julio*.
- González, César (dir.) (2013), *Diagnóstico esperanza*.

Haneke, Michael (dir.) (2017), *Happy End*.

Jiménez, Hernán (dir.) (2005), *Doble llave y cadena*.

——— (2009), *A ojos cerrados*.

——— (2011), *El regreso*.

Lins, Consuelo (dir.) (2010), *Babás*.

Mascaro, Gabriel (dir.) (2012), *Doméstica*.

Massa, Ezio (dir.) (2008), *Villa*.

Panizza, Tiziana (dir.) (2005), *Dear Nonna: A Film Letter*.

——— (2008), *Remitente: una carta visual*.

——— (2012), *Al final: la última carta*.

Piñeyro, Marcelo (dir.) (2002), *Kamchatka*.

ⁱ For a useful summary of these, see Mallett (2004).

ⁱⁱ The influence of Hamid Naficy's notion of 'accented cinema' (2001) made by displaced individuals living in the West has been notable in this regard.

ⁱⁱⁱ The legacy of this approach remains evident in contemporary film studies: see for instance the room-by-room analysis of the house undertaken in the edited volume *Spaces of the Cinematic Home* (Andrews et al 2016).

^{iv} See Martin (2016) and Nouzeilles (2005).